

both appear to have the ~~depression~~ ^{depression} each ^{end} forming a distinct pycnochloem in Panay, and the habit is quite Araliaceous.

I think I must reduce your *Mytilocarpus* *nitens* (which is in Australia) to *Markea* the apparently chambered nutlets are only so in outward appearance as you say in your description and there is a trace of the transverse construction in *M. begoniifolia* - the disk varies in the different species of *Markea* (of which we have 2 besides *begoniifolia* and *nitens*)

We have all I think been mistaken about *Mylocarpus* Cav. I think his *C. racemosa* if not identical with your *C. coffeoides* at any rate is close to it and with *Cupia densiflora* DC. *Greifithia Gardneri* Thunb. and your *S. Harveyi* forms a little group that must go into *Randia* as I proposed for *C. densiflora* in H. Koenig, Thwaites', Ceylon plant is perhaps specifically identical with *A. densiflora* - *C. racemosa* Cav. and *S. Harveyi* differ slightly but perhaps constantly and may be maintained as species. - *Mylocarpus* however as understood by W. & Arn. by Thwaites and by myself for *S. Webera* *S. sambucina* (which is in Australia) and other Pavetta-like plants with terminal cymes may be kept as a genus but cannot retain *Swartzii*'s name. I propose to take up the older one of *Webera* (which originally applied to *S. Webera* and which is not wanted even by the most multiplying of modern nomenclaturists

25. WILTON PLACE,
S.W.

March 8/66

My dear Gray

I sent you the two additional copies you asked for of Part II of *Genera* with the last part of *Linnaea* journal in consequence of your last letter to Hooker. I think we shall venture in the next box sent from New, to put in a few extra copies which we will only charge you when you have disposed of them.

I now write chiefly to ask you if you have anything to say about Australian Compositae. I am about to commence printing the third vol. of my *Flora Australiensis*. It has been very hard work. *Eucalyptus* alone took me full three months six good hours a day uninterrupted work and all the taxes required so much hooting to get at their inside that they delayed me much - since that I have got on quicker. I have finished down to Compositae excepting *Rubraea* in the

midst of which I am now - and shall have
only about 900 species altogether for the volume
which I have promised should be an eyebrow
which I think one and so I shall have to include
the whole of Compositae provided they
do not exceed 2000 or 3000 species. The great
question I want your opinion about - if
you have cut your teeth on it - as to the ideas
between *Eurybia* and *Aster* - and I trust
you will not mind my applying to you
when after all thought I find generally I
have to follow you yet I like always to
judge for myself. F. Mueller in his last
fragmentum acknowledges the identity of
Eurybia and *Olearia* in which I believe he
is right - *Olearia* being the oldest name, but
also says there is no difference between
them and *Aster* and therefore renames all
the *Eurybias* as *Aster*, and for fear of
losing the "F. Mueller" if that should not be
adopted also publishes them all as *Olearia*.
I always thought there had been a
constant difference in the lobes and
flattened achenes - how does that stand?
Have you any other suggestion to make about
Australian Compositae? I hope very much to
be able to consolidate some of the monotypic or

almost monotypic Gnaphaloid genera.

I have nearly 100 Australian Umbelliferae and
R. & S. Araliaceae - Seemann has made a much
better job - much more at the outside
than the inside of flowers - and yet I cannot
conceive the principle of putting *Aralia* in
Umbelliferae and *Crithmum* and *Hydrocotyle*
in Hederaeae. In his new part of *Flora Vitensis*
he enters at length into the reasons he had already
given for considering *Hydrocotyle* as Hederaeae
with the special character of valvate petals and
the only species in his flora is *H. Asiatica* with
very imbricate petals - the fact is he took his
character from *H. vulgaris* without looking at any
other - there are two groups in *Hydrocotyle*
Euhydrocotyle with valvate petals and *Centella*
to which *H. Asiatica* belongs with imbricate petals.
The annuals which Seemann proposes to remove
to Drimytoria! have nearly all valvate petals.
The fact is *Hydrocotyle* is a very good genus but
with scarcely any character but the stipules, and
must remain in Umbelliferae.

I am glad you followed Stuebel & Decaisne in
putting the *Guibergias* into *Aralia* - leaving the
name of *Passiflora* Linn. for his *R. fruticosa* and
other former *Chytrid* *Notthopanax*.

Seemann's distinction between *Hedera*
Australiae & *Hedera* proper is all back except
the pinnate foliage which cannot be a
general distinction - the genus *ruminata* Aublet
is the same in both, and there is no difference in the ovary.

I agree however with Seemann in transferring
Astrorhiza and *Borfieldia* to *Araliaceae* as